

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-9 are all the claims pending in the application. By this amendment, Applicant is amending claims 1 and 5, and canceling claims 7-9, thus, leaving claims 1 and 3-5 pending.

**I. Drawings**

The Examiner is silent regarding the status of replacement FIG. 8 filed with the Amendment on October 17, 2007. **Applicants request confirmation of the acceptance of this drawing in the next Office paper.**

**II. Rejections under § 112**

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In particular, the Examiner asserts that claim 1 omits essential structural cooperative relationships.

Claim 1 currently recites that the engagement mechanism provides engagement between the lever and the rotor, and the engagement mechanism includes the protrusion and the guide mechanism. Still further, the guide mechanism includes an allowing means for allowing movement of the protrusion of the lever. Thus, it is believed that there is adequate structure linking the guide mechanism to the lever.

However, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants amend claim 1 to remove any ambiguities.

**III. Rejections under § 102(b)**

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wegner (6,082,158).

### **Analysis**

According to the Examiner's analysis, "upon completion of one full 360° rotation of the rotor" does not necessarily mean that the rotor is returned back to its original position apparently because the rotor could still move on to any number of positions after one full rotation.

Claim 1 is amended to clarify that one rotation means that the rotor is returned to its original position at the conclusion of one rotation. With this change to claim 1, it is clear that one single rotation of the rotor causes the lever to rest in the other one of the first and second position from before the rotation of the rotor.

Wegner fails to teach or suggest this capability for the reasons outlined in the previously filed responses. Moreover, Wegner fails to disclose the particular allowing means and guide mechanism of the present invention.

Thus, claim 1 is distinguishable from Wegner.

The remaining claims depend from claim 1. These claims should be patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, by virtue of their dependency therefrom.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
U.S. Application No.: 10/720,140

Attorney Docket No.: Q78533

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ellen R. Smith/

---

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Ellen R. Smith  
Registration No. 43,042

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 9 2008